

Date: Fri, 1 Oct 93 04:30:15 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #357
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 1 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 357

Today's Topics:

 Codeless Tech Debate
 The Canadian Perspective Returns

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 93 19:41:07 CDT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@ames.arpa
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

fmitch@netcom.com (Felton Mitchell) writes:

> robert (robert@amanda.jpunix.com) wrote:
> : perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:
>
> : > How about an equivalent three-level operator's test in some other modes
> : > like packet, AMTOR, RTTY, etc?
>
> : How about just completing the current examination requirements?
> : Contrary to popular opinion, it's NOT a big deal. It just requires
> : effort.
>
> : Unfortunately, the current "welfare mentality" doesn't reward effort.
>

> : --Robert
>
>
> And while we are at it, let's talk about setting requirements for using your
> computer. To use your computer, consider requiring 1.) you demonstrate the
> ability to type at 20 words per minute (of course, using all ten fingers),
> and 2.) you demonstrate the ability to write a device driver in your
> computer's native machine language (not assembly... you have to show
> you can calculate branch targets in hex...).

The use of computers is not governed by a licensing process set forth by the Federal Communications Commission. However, in all fairness, there are those of us who are not computer-illiterate, and started on mainframes in the Seventies. So, some smart cookie might honor your challenge, and in the process, would rub your nose in the dirt. Of course, that person won't be me. I have better things to do than to write device drivers for you using all ten fingers.

--Robert

Date: 30 SEP 93 05:37:02 GMT
From: tribune.usask.ca!skyfox!a01muma@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: The Canadian Perspective Returns
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

All of you that are using my Canadian perspective title are causing great confusion, in that most of the messages under that heading have little to do with Canada at all (or my original message for that matter). I would also like to acknowledge that I am sure there are many other Canadian perspectives, but this message group seems to be mostly dominated by Americans debating the Tech issue. Tech Class is equivalent to the Canadian Basic class (roughly), but in Canada no HF privileges a

(oops, pushed return a bunch)

A basic licensee has privileges up to the 6 meter band, no HF. I am not sure exactly what the American allocations are, but I will restate my earlier opinion that people who have not proven some commitment to the hobby beyond memorization of some questions should not be allowed to make contact with people around the world. I will receive a lot of flak for saying CW promotes good operating practices, but I can hear the howls of anguish at suggesting Hams have a learner's license so that they are continually monitored for good operating practices until someone else decides they've earned the privilege of HF. Until someone comes up with a better plan CW is the only way of keeping the undedicated (I know some of you have a hard time learning, but I can't solve all your problems) and unruly where they can't hurt others, themselves and the reputation of hams in general.

Just in case you are wondering, I realize that not everyone who knows CW is an A-1 operator, and there are many without CW who I consider to be excellent representations of the amateur community.

You can wake up now.

-<:=) Scott Muma VE5AXX since ????

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #357
